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# Sub-topic 1: UE beam type and DRX implications in Rel-18 Inactive Beam Correspondence

**Way forward/Agreement:**

* The UE need not indicate support of BC without UL beam sweeping in inactive and IA. The usability of this capability is not clear at this point

**Way forward/FFS:**

* FFS: How beam refinement may work in RRC\_INACTIVE (RA-SDT and CG-SDT) and initial access
* FFS: Discuss the impact of fine beam vs rough beam for UE UL Tx beam on the test(s)
* FFS: Discuss if the refinement is the same as Rel-16 SSB only case
* FFS: Whether the peak EIRP the same as Rel-16 SSB only case achieved.
* FFS: Discuss DRX implications on UE beam refinement and on BC accuracy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree, include justification |
| Qualcomm | Perhaps the agreement can be reworded to something like ‘The network presumes UE does not depend on UL beam sweeping functionality for beam correspondence in inactive or idle mode’ |
| OPPO | QC alternative is better, but small changes maybe:  “The network presumes…” ->  “It is assumed UE does not depend on UL beam sweeping functionality for beam correspondence in inactive or idle mode”  Because this is not for the NW scheduling discussion, this is the assumption for requirement definition. |
| Verizon | Agree with Qualcomm! |
|  |  |